



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

the accused to show his own good character, another exception has been introduced in actions for slander imputing a crime, where truth has been pleaded. *Harding v. Brooks*, 5 Pick. (Mass.) 244; *Downey v. Dillon*, 52 Ind. 442. *Contra*, *Matthews v. Huntley*, 9 N. H. 146; *Houghtaling v. Kelderhouse*, 2 Barb. (N. Y.) 149 (affirmed 1 N. Y. 530). A somewhat similar exception has been advocated wherever, as in the principal case, the act in issue is itself also a crime. *Hein v. Holdridge*, 78 Minn. 468, 81 N. W. 522. *Contra*, *Continental Ins. Co. v. Jacknichen*, 110 Ind. 59, 10 N. E. 636; *Adams v. Elseffer*, 132 Mich. 100, 92 N. W. 772. In following the analogy of the criminal cases, these two last exceptions overlook the historical fact that the rule in criminal cases is an exception made in favor of the criminal in an attempt to mitigate the severity of the old English criminal law. See *Matthews v. Huntley*, *supra*, 148. This consideration has no place in a civil suit. On the other hand, the dangers of complicating the issue, prolonging the trial and prejudicing the jury weigh heavily against extending the exceptions to the character rule.

EVIDENCE — OPINION EVIDENCE — EXPERT TESTIMONY: CALCULATION OF PROBABILITY. — The defendant was indicted for having offered in evidence a typewritten document with knowledge of its fraudulent alteration. It was shown that certain peculiarities of the form and alignment of the letters of the alteration corresponded exactly with peculiarities in specimens of writing from the defendant's typewriter. The defendant brought out from testimony given by typewriter experts the many causes and great frequency of occurrence of such peculiarities. In answer to a hypothetical question propounded by the prosecution assuming a certain frequency to the appearance of each defect, an assumption apparently unwarranted by any evidence, an expert mathematician then calculated for the jury the chances of the coincidence of these defects in another machine as being one in four billion. *Held*, that the admission of this mathematician's testimony was reversible error. *People v. Risley*, 214 N. Y. 75, 108 N. E. 200.

For a discussion of mathematically determined probability and its use in evidence, see NOTES, p. 693.

EVIDENCE — OPINION EVIDENCE — HANDWRITING: TESTING LAY WITNESSES BY EXTRANEOUS TRUE AND FORGED SIGNATURES. — Witnesses who were acquainted with the defendant's handwriting from having seen him write or having seen his admitted signatures in the course of business, affirmed the authenticity of a disputed signature. On the cross-examination they were asked to pass upon the authenticity of other signatures, both true and forged. The merit of their answers was displayed by proving the authorship of these signatures in a manner which would have made authentic signatures admissible for the purpose of juxtaposition on the direct examination. *Held*, that such a test is not permissible. *Fourth National Bank of Fayetteville v. McArthur*, 84 S. E. 39 (N. C.).

The interesting problem of impeaching lay witnesses as to handwriting, which the case raises, is discussed in this issue of the REVIEW, p. 699.

EVIDENCE — OPINION EVIDENCE — SELF-DEFENSE: BYSTANDER'S OPINION OF DEFENDANT'S DANGER FROM DECEASED. — At a homicide trial the defendant pleaded self-defense and testified to her belief that the deceased was about to shoot. A witness, after describing the actions of the deceased, was then asked what he thought the deceased was doing with his right hand, and would have answered that "his impression" was that he "was attempting to draw a pistol." *Held*, that it was error to exclude this testimony. *Latham v. State*, 172 S. W. 797 (Tex. Cr. App.).

The lower court excluded the evidence on the ground that it was opinion